DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 905 PS 030 357

TITLE	Fathering and Family Processes Roundtable, Summary (Oakland, California, October 19-20, 2000).
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. National Center on Fathers and Families.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	40p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center on Fathers and Families, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3440 Market Street, Suite 450, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3325. Tel: 215-573-5500; Fax: 215-573-5508; e-mail: mailbox@ncoff.gse.upenn.edu; Web site: http://www.ncoff.gse.upenn.edu.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Custody; Definitions; Family Relationship; *Fathers; Mothers; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Participation; *Public Policy; *Research Needs

ABSTRACT

In October of 2000 more than 30 researchers, policymakers, practitioners, school leaders, and other specialists in the field of fathers and families gathered to convene the National Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) Roundtable on Fathering and Family Processes. Themes emerging from the roundtable discussion included: refining concepts of fatherhood and paternal involvement; a shift of focus to family processes; and incorporating cultural specificity into research, policy, and practice. This report synthesizes the discussion of these themes and their implications for policymaking. The first section of the paper includes summaries of the research papers presented, as well as discussants' and participants' commentaries. The second section describes the current and emerging issues relating to father poverty and social vulnerability that arose during the discussions; these issues include extending notions of family goals and culture, understanding gender roles and power dynamics, and incorporating culture, class, and race. The third section offers new directions for research, including relating research directly to policy and practice, and studying perceptions as outcomes, not just inputs. The fourth section explores the implications of the issues raised for policymaking. The final section describes lessons learned for educators, practitioners, and program designers. The report concludes with the Roundtable agenda and participant list. (HTH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 905

Fathering and Family Processes Roundtable, Summary (Oakland, California, October 19-20, 2000)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ❑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ❑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Haider

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PS 030 357

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fathering and Family Processes Roundtable

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

NCOFF's Family Development Study Group 1

Summary of Themes from the Roundtable Discussion 2

About This Report 3

Summary of Roundtable Papers 4

"Father Involvement, Family Processes, Community Influences, and Teen Problem Behavior: A Plan of Study" by Randal Day and Alan Acock 4

"The Fathers of Delinquent Youth and Their Participation in Family-Based Intervention Efforts" by Stephen Gavazzi, Charles Partridge, and Angie M. Schock 7

"A Conceptual Framework for Family Processes and Their Link to Fathering" by Suzanne Bartle-Haring 9

"Youth Ratings of Role Performance of Resident and Nonresident Fathers: A First Look at NLSY97" by Alan Acock and Randal Day 10

Current and Emerging Issues in Fathering and Family Processes 13

Locating the Intersections 13

Exploring Nonessential, Essential, and Additive Notions of Fatherhood 13

Graduating from Structure to Process 14

Extending Notions of Family Goals and Culture 15

Defining the Family Through Contextual Issues and Relationships 16

Including Nonresidential Fathers 16

Acknowledging Stepfamilies 17

Understanding Gender Roles and Power Dynamics 17

Incorporating Culture, Class, and Race 18

Using Family Systems Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Examining Family Processes 18

continued

Table of Contents *continued*

Directions for Research 19

Relating Research Directly to Policy and Practice 19

Determining Whether and How Fathers Matter 19

Understanding "Biological" and "Social" Father-Child Relationships 20

Linking Qualitative and Quantitative Research 21

Considering New Directions in Statistical Analyses 22

Studying Perceptions as Outcomes, Not Just Inputs 23

Capturing the Context 23

Evaluating Interventions 24

Implications for Policymaking 26

Funding Basic Research and Evaluations 26

Adding Father-Related Questions to National Surveys 26

Promoting Noncustodial Father Involvement 27

Considering Intergenerationality and Role Transitions 27

Defining the Family 27

Remembering that One Family Type Does Not Fit All 27

Pinpointing the Importance of Residency and Nonresidency 28

Lessons for Practice 29

Differentiating Between Mood Disorders and Delinquency 29

Promoting Fathers' Caretaking Through Interventions 29

Facilitating Mother-Father Concordance on Family Goals 29

Shortshrifting Mothers? 30

Getting Fathers Involved 30

Helping Families Verbalize Their Processes 31

Helping Researchers Link Qualitative and Quantitative Studies 31

Roundtable Agenda 32

Participant List 35

Introduction

On October 19 and 20, 2000, more than 30 researchers, policymakers, practitioners, school leaders and other specialists in the field of fathers and families gathered in Oakland, CA, to convene the National Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) Roundtable on Fathering and Family Processes.

Over the last two decades, family researchers have accumulated evidence linking family composition and practices to a number of significant outcomes for children: school failure, criminal activity, drug use, antisocial behavior, and a variety of other childhood problems. What is less clear is how family behavior—and father involvement, in particular—actually directs, retards, promotes, or otherwise influences such outcomes.

Participants in this Roundtable explored how family practices and father involvement might improve child outcomes and enhance their chances for successful transition into adult roles. The Roundtable was also intended to contribute to the development of the ongoing work of the Fathering and Family Processes research team, part of NCOFF's Family Development Study Group.

NCOFF's Family Development Study Group

The Family Development Study Group was engaged in a number of field studies examining father involvement, family processes, and juvenile offenders. Their working papers served as the basis for discussion at the Roundtable, whose goals were to develop a research agenda that applies current research findings in clinical or community intervention settings; shapes the development of qualitative research methodologies; explores ways of analyzing emerging national data sets; and informs theoretical notions of fatherhood.

The Study Group asked Roundtable participants to consider their current and future research plans in light of the following questions:

- Which are the best new ideas regarding fathers and family processes that could be applied to research and that offer useful directions for policy and practice?

Family researchers have accumulated evidence linking family composition and practices to a number of significant outcomes in children. What is less clear is how family behavior—and father involvement, in particular—actually influences such outcomes.

- How can the two types of analyses—qualitative and quantitative—be better united?

- What external ideas should inform the group's work?

The Roundtable conversation synthesized the findings, themes, and questions raised in the Study Group's papers and during the accompanying discussion. Participants also offered critiques on current knowledge in the field, commenting on its implications for research on child development and family studies, for national and local policymaking, and for practice and intervention programs. Special attention was paid to cultural specificity, concepts of fatherhood and paternal involvement, qualitative methodologies, and data representing the multiple perspectives of informants.

As for all Roundtable discussions, the meeting's primary goals were to:

1. Present a comprehensive analysis of issues and problems identified in the fathers and families literature;

2. Deepen the discourse around these issues between and among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers;

3. Engage participants in the development of a research agenda, as an initial activity in a longer-term research study

4. Move the Roundtable and the field past the idea stage toward the conduct of sound basic and practice-driven research; and

5. Involve practitioners closely in the conceptualization of research projects pursued by NCOFF and others in the field.

After discussants delivered summaries of key themes and findings from the research papers, the authors were given a brief period in which to respond to discussant's questions. The discussants' presentations also broadened the scope of each paper, placing the issues raised in a wider context or suggesting new ways of conceptualizing them. Moderators then led a discussion on these themes among all Roundtable participants, who used them to explore new directions for research and practice and implications for policymaking.

Summary of Themes from the Roundtable Discussion

Several overarching themes, which are discussed in detail in subsequent sections of this report, emerged from the discussion:

- Concepts of fatherhood and paternal involvement must be refined, particularly whether and how fathers matter, and if they have a unique and irreplaceable role to play in the family. Research, policy, and practice need to determine the similarities, differences, and impact of the biological versus nonbiological father/father figure and the effect of father residency or nonresidency on child outcomes.

- The field needs to move from its traditional emphasis on family structure to a focus on family processes. Systems theory is one useful means of understanding these processes. Here, the family is understood as an entity greater than the sum of its parts—one upon which change or action by one part affects the whole. An exploration of the wide variety of inner familial processes could enable research, policy, and programs to identify and respond to complex and subtle factors that influence child outcomes.

- The term "family" must be more broadly and accurately defined in all of its manifestations; moreover, research, policy and practice need to be aware of how the definition of family affects their perception of process and outcomes in the families they study. The dynamics of stepfamilies also need to be explored further.

Systems theory is one useful means of understanding family processes. Here, the family is understood as an entity greater than the sum of its parts—one upon which change/action by one part affects the whole.

- Qualitative and quantitative data should not constitute separate realms but should be used in the same study to inform each other. Researchers and practitioners should be encouraged to work together to improve the development of research methodologies, the design of practice, both types of data collection, and the subsequent interpretation of findings; policymakers should help to ensure that a full range of family process indicators are collected in national data sets. Also, better qualitative information can be obtained by considering the role of the observer in studies, both for possible bias and as a source of additional perspectives.

- Cultural specificity—the ways in which family goals and strategies may differ in light of culture, as may definitions of functional or dysfunctional families and individuals—must

be incorporated into research, policy, and practice. In general, families should be viewed and interpreted with sensitivity and in light of their larger social ecology.

- Notions of race, gender, class, and power should be taken into account as factors in family processes and outcomes, along with a greater awareness of how assumptions about these categories affect how research is conceptualized, how findings are interpreted, and how the knowledge created informs policymaking and the design or evaluation of programs.

About This Report

This report synthesizes the discussion of these themes and their implications for policymaking, the directions they indicate for future research, and the lessons they impart for practice. The first section contains summaries of the research papers presented at the Roundtable, as well as discussants' and participants' commentaries. The second section describes the current and emerging issues in father poverty and social vulnerability that arose during the Roundtable discussions. The third section offers new directions for research. The fourth section explores the implications of the issues raised for policymaking. The final section describes lessons learned for practice.

Summary of Roundtable Papers

NCOFF asked Roundtable participants to explore the issues discussed in four papers: (1) "Father Involvement, Family Processes, Community Influences, and Teen Problem Behavior: A Plan of Study" by Randal Day and Alan Acock; (2) "The Role of Fathers of Delinquent Youth and Their Participation in Family-Based Intervention Efforts" by Stephen M. Gavazzi, Charles Partridge, and Angie Schock; (3) "A Conceptual Framework for Family Processes and Their Link to Fathering" by Suzanne Bartle-Haring; and (4) "Youth Ratings of Role Performance of Resident and Nonresident Fathers" by Alan Acock and Randal Day.

This section summarizes the four papers and the related commentary from research presentations. The cross-cutting issues raised during the discussion of these papers are described in the second section of this report.

"Father Involvement, Family Processes, Community Influences, and Teen Problem Behavior: A Plan of Study"

Discussant: Scott Coltrane, University of California, Riverside

Author: Randal Day, Brigham Young University
Alan Acock, Oregon State University

Moderator: Geraldo Rodriguez, Los Angeles County Community and Senior Services

Day and Acock's study explores how family and neighborhood life play significant roles in ensuring the well-being of younger teens. The authors attempt to answer a central question: How crucial is family structure to the well-being of the family and the individual? They also asked: How powerful are family processes relative to family structure, community influences, and individual characteristics of family members?

Day and Acock's research used data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth–1997 (NLSY97) to assess the impact of family processes, or family social capital, on the well-being of teenage children. The NLSY97 contains a significantly enhanced battery of family process measures that allowed Day and Acock to assess how family social capital contributes to child well-being and adjustment. Day and Acock also included an analysis of neighborhood effects to assess the relative contribution and interaction of family, community, and peer-related variables.

A Review of Family Structure and Its Effects on Child Well-Being

In recent years, destructive behaviors such as drug use and criminal activity have replaced disease as the most prominent cause of death in young people. Current research examining the effects of inner family life on the well-being of teens suggests that such problem behaviors can be better understood using a family processes approach.

Understanding child well-being in terms of family processes represents a shift from structural explanations: recent studies have demonstrated that family configuration and structure—even the effects of divorce or remarriage—are not nearly as predictive of family well-being as family process variables such as patterns of parent interaction, sibling connections, discipline strategies, and other family systemic qualities. Additionally, research suggests that children can flourish in any family structure—even in the face of

limited resources—when family processes are strengthened.

The Importance of Family Social Capital/Family Processes. Because a family is not merely a collection of individuals but a relationship among individuals, Day and Acock contend, we can better understand the outcomes of family members by understanding the social mechanisms within families. These mechanisms include "social capital"—properties such as parental monitoring, levels of familial trust, and expectations that support the meeting of goals and transmission of values—and "family processes," the means by which families not only organize and direct daily activities but also resolve conflicts.

Many families are ineffective in managing these conflicts. Research suggests that disrupted family processes have a direct impact on a younger teen's ability to inhibit antisocial tendencies. Further, children raised in hostile, rejecting, neglectful, or coercive home situations learn to respond to problems in more destructive ways, and tend to associate with peers who engage in antisocial behavior.

Within families, the level of parent-teen conflicts is determined to a large extent by the environment found in inner family life. When there is a climate of warmth and supportiveness, there are fewer teen-parent conflicts; in hostile, coercive homes, parent-child disagreements often escalate into destructive teen behavior. Similarly, hostile forms of expression in parent-parent disagreements have been shown to be a critical factor in problem behavior among youth.

Conversely, when parents use more effective parenting strategies, children are more socially competent, i.e., more likely to demonstrate adaptive functioning in interpersonal relationships and the ability to adjust in the face of new situations. The way in which parents interact with each other, and with their children, influences their children's social competence. For example, children whose parents have shown firm control and moderate levels of monitoring manifest specific traits associated with social competence, such as higher levels of self-control and self-worth.

Father Involvement and Adolescent Well-Being. Day and Acock have found that although mothers' negative parenting strongly contributes to their children's delinquent behavior patterns, an inadequate father-child relationship—characterized by abusiveness, chronic neglect, and lack of involvement—is an even more common factor in the backgrounds of troubled children. Moreover, delinquent adolescents tend to have fathers who themselves have troubled histories. Past research has explored the effects of paternal absence rather than paternal behavior, but, the authors believe, how men contribute positively to family dynamics may be more important than whether they are physically present. He maintains that enough evidence now exists to suggest: (1) the quality of family life does matter in delinquent behavior of adolescents; and (2) fathers are an important resource in changing children's negative behavior.

Past research has explored the effects of paternal absence rather than paternal behavior, but how men contribute positively to family dynamics may be more important than whether they are physically present.

Family Resources and Adolescent Well-Being. Family economic stability, parent education and occupation, and family income levels are all important family resources that potentially influence adolescent well-being. Of these resources, family income is a key factor in understanding both positive and maladaptive behavior in adolescents. Research has shown that growing up in a poor family significantly reduces the future educational and earning level of teens making the transition into adulthood and that young, impoverished teens are much more likely to experience out-of-wedlock birth, especially if their parents are divorced. And while the economic resources of parents have a direct effect on well-being, they also have less obvious impacts: poorer or wealthier parents pos-

sess different conceptions of how to succeed in life, different sets of priorities and goals, and a different set of social contacts, which, in turn, may affect their parenting styles.

Neighborhood Resources. While data on neighborhood variables are limited, the general community environment (e.g. levels of crime, gang visibility, quality of housing, etc.) does affect families. Day and Acock conclude that concentrations of male joblessness, poverty, and increases in female-headed households in neighborhoods correlate with increases in social isolation and shifts in social and cultural norms that likely have a negative influence on child well-being.

Conceptual Model, Analysis, and Results

Day and Acock posit that their study's pivotal research question is the extent to which family processes mitigate adverse effects associated with limited financial and educational resources, the effect of peers, and family disruption. The conceptual model they have constructed measures the influence of family processes and relationships on the outcomes of young adolescents. Variables such as family structure, family resources, neighborhood, school resources, and the influence of peers were also included in the model.

Day and Acock felt strongly that their model should be fitted simultaneously for different family structures and racial/ethnic groups, and will estimate variations of this model for these variables in their future analyses. For example, African Americans and Hispanic Americans typically have lower financial resources, and thus their family processes may exert an even greater influence on youth outcomes. Little is known about the specific magnitude of the impact, however, because there are few studies in this area with sufficient numbers of minority respondents.

The only exogenous variables in the authors' model depict family and neighborhood resources. The primary variables to be examined are the family's income, parents' education, and other family resources. Family process variables are shown as direct predictors of both peer variables and outcome variables. The peer variables of attitudes, behaviors, and expectations are anticipated to have a direct effect on outcomes at different points in time.

To what extent do family processes mitigate adverse effects associated with limited financial and educational resources, the effect of peers, and family disruption?

One utility of this model is its ability to extend the initial reliability and validity analysis presented by Child Trends measures of family process variables. The NLSY97 provides multiple informants for many of the process variables it measures, since each youth and his/her parent were asked parallel sets of questions. Using a structured means confirmatory factor analysis, Day and Acock's model will examine the measurement properties of key process variables and compare the perceptions of parents and youths.

Day and Acock are using a variety of statistical procedures to perform the analysis, using their conceptual model of family processes. They will apply structural equation modeling to estimate models that include latent variables for any of the predictor or outcome variables. These variables allow an estimate of measurement error and the incorporation of the estimated measurement error into the model.

The effects of family structure (two-parent versus single parent) compared to other predictors (resources, peers, and family process variables) will be assessed using a multiple group, structured means design model. For example, it will be possible to estimate a structural model simultaneously for single- and two-parent families, while also testing for differences in means as well as irrelevant, incremental, equal, and interaction effects.

"The Fathers of Delinquent Youth and Their Participation in Family-Based Intervention Efforts"

Discussants: Howard Pinderhughes, University of California, San Francisco
Phillip Bowman, University of Illinois, Chicago

Author: Stephen Gavazzi, Charles Partridge, and Angie M. Schock, The Ohio State University

Moderator: Eloise Anderson, Claremont Institute

In this paper, Stephen Gavazzi and his colleagues focus on the fathers of youth who exhibit delinquent behavior and/or mental illness, and the roles these fathers play in family-based intervention efforts designed to prevent relapse. They attempt to synthesize information generated from studies of specific family-based interventions separately targeting childhood mood disorders and delinquent behaviors with the broader literature concerning family, parenting and father-specific factors. They then seek to identify the most salient elements that such family programming efforts should consider regarding father recruitment and retention, given the significant co-occurrence of criminal activity and mental health problems in adolescents.

Summary of Findings on Mood-Disordered Youth

The authors presented the findings of an analysis of data collected using various protocols including the "Understanding Mood Disorders Questionnaire" and the "Expressed Emotion Adjective Checklist" to assess fathers' knowledge of their child's mental illness and identify characteristics of the father-child relationship. They also presented information generated from a focus group with consumers and referral agents that asked about: (1) barriers to father participation in intervention programs to deal with mental illness; and (2) specific issues seen as important to increasing the likelihood of father participation in such programs.

The authors report the following findings from their analysis:

- Surveyed fathers tend to know less than mothers about the mental illness of their child, and could benefit from direct educational information about the mood disorder.
- Fathers may have more negative and less positive interactions with their mood-disordered children, and thus programming could benefit from the addition of measures to enhance the father-child relationship.
- Targeted programming for fathers would need to be delivered within a father-friendly framework that takes into account a variety of father-specific needs and attitudes, such as work schedules/demands and a reluctance among fathers to accept that a child has a mental illness or that fathers should play a role in treatment.
- All of these efforts need to take place within a family-based format that emphasizes the importance of having both mothers and fathers present in sessions.

The authors then explore the extent to which the findings and recommendations regarding mood-disordered youth can be extrapolated to families of youth in the juvenile justice system.

Applying Findings to Delinquent Youth

Gavazzi, Partridge, and Schock stress the distinction between delinquent behavior that arises during adolescence and Conduct Disorder (CD), a diagnosable mental disorder, and discuss the many complexities of identifying whether behavior has an emotional or environmental cause or both.

They point out, however, that fathers' parenting skills and mental health have

indeed been shown to play a role in all of the problems that their children experience. In particular, they point to the connection between "inadequate fathering" as a more common predictor of delinquency than inappropriate maternal behavior, and the prevalence of fathers with their own history of antisocial behavior.

Defining the Problem and Identifying the Father's Role. The authors further examine the links between father characteristics and delinquent youth by reviewing a sample of 57 families referred by the juvenile court system to Growing Up FAST: Families and Adolescents Surviving and Thriving. Growing Up FAST is a primary prevention/family strengthening initiative currently being implemented and evaluated by Gavazzi and his colleagues at The Ohio State University.

Among other things, the review found that fatherly support shown to adolescents—affection, communication, and consistent monitoring and discipline, among other factors—is related to lower anger levels in both sons and daughters, and is associated with less delinquent behavior.

Effectiveness of the Growing Up FAST Intervention. Gavazzi, Partridge, and Schock evaluated the success of Growing Up FAST as a father-intervention program. They believe that the first level in the five-level Growing Up FAST program—which focuses on helping family members move away from positions of blame, anger, and stigma toward positions of shared responsibility, support, and respect —is probably the most important. At this level, participants focus on identifying paternal risk and protective factors within the delinquent youth's family.

Fathers' parenting skills and mental health have been shown to play a role in adolescent problems. In particular, they point to the connection between "inadequate fathering" as a more common predictor of delinquency than inappropriate maternal behavior.

The authors note several weaknesses in the program that have yet to be addressed:

- The program does not currently capitalize on the psychological inroads made at the first level, *vis a vis* paternal risk and protective factors.
- Lack of family "readiness," that is, a family's willingness and/or ability to receive services for problems associated with adolescent involvement in juvenile court matters, must be addressed.
- Issues concerning nonresidential fathers and single-parent mothers have been routinely ignored.
- More attention needs to be paid to the role of mothers as gatekeepers in the utilization of family support services.

Some families of delinquent youth would benefit from family-based interventions similar to those addressing mental illness, and special effort should be made to enhance the involvement of fathers.

The researchers conclude that at least some families of delinquent youth would benefit from family-based interventions similar to those addressing mental illness, and that similar effort should be made to enhance the involvement of fathers. In particular:

- Dual parent participation with the youth should be emphasized.
- Special attention should be given to increasing father knowledge of any psychological impairment in the child.
- Programming should encourage greater father-adolescent interaction in order to increase positive exchanges.
- Intervention efforts need to be developed within a context that is father-friendly.

"A Conceptual Framework for Family Processes and Their Link to Fathering"

Discussants: Janet Melby, Iowa State University
Maureen Waller, Public Policy Institute of California

Author: Suzanne Bartle-Haring, The Ohio State University

Moderator: Ray Copper, Bay Area Male Involvement Network (BAMIN)

Suzanne Bartle-Haring has devised a conceptual framework in which to understand family processes and the father's role in those processes. This framework is based on systems theory, grounded in the notion that what makes a system unique is not the parts comprising the system, but the relationship among its parts. Thus, within a systems framework, the interrelationships among family members, rather than the individuals who comprise that family, become central to understanding family processes. Moreover, the complex relationships among members of the system—and the subsystems within it—are considered to be governed by a recurring, predictable, and purposeful set of rules and strategies that are structured around common goals and tasks and reflected in how family members interact with one another.

Separateness and Connectedness: A Central Theme in Family Processes

The author introduces the concepts of separateness and connectedness as central themes of family life and the organizing principles for all subsequent family processes. Balancing these two opposing themes —autonomy versus intimacy—is achieved by maintaining boundaries. As families become comfortable with particular boundary configurations (rigid boundaries that resist change or "permeable" ones that allow adjustments), these boundaries will also dictate the way feedback processes (how families adapt to their environment) work within the family. Thus, developing a family identity, engaging in rituals and customs, and establishing communication patterns all serve to maintain or change the current balance between separateness and connectedness.

Bartle-Haring illustrates three family processes that are outcomes of this attempt at balance.

Separateness/Connectedness and the Management of Family System Boundaries. Two types of family boundaries, external and internal, must be defined and maintained. External boundaries differentiate the family from other systems and establish rules and strategies for interacting with "outsiders" and the larger social systems. Internal boundaries regulate the flow of information between and within family subsystems and distances between individuals therein.

Bartle-Haring contends that the successful management of the tension between separateness and connectedness results in the family developing boundary customs that allow for both the expression of individuality and the experience of a secure connection to the family. These boundary customs are presumed to create an optimal environment for personal development.

Maintaining a balance between separateness and connectedness is the central theme of family life, and the organizing principle for all subsequent family processes.

Separateness/Connectedness and the Management of Identity Issues Within Family Systems. Closely intertwined with boundary customs are the customs that evolve around issues of family identity. All families must facilitate the development of a sense of individuality and a social identity, for both individual family members and the family as a whole.

A well-functioning family manages these identity tasks in a way that simultaneously promotes the well-being and self-esteem of individual family members and fosters an adaptive connection to other members of society. Ineffective fami-

ly systems management is evident when the establishment of family or personal identities is accompanied by heightened degrees of alienation from other family members or representatives of other social systems (e.g., peers, schools, neighbors, etc.).

Separateness/Connectedness and the Management of the Emotional Climate within Family Systems. Managing the family's emotional climate includes evolving strategies for nurturing and supporting family members, building family togetherness, making decisions, and maintaining power and control, all of which can be thought of as products of the ongoing tension between separateness and connectedness.

Managing conflicts that result from the competing needs for separateness and connectedness, in particular, is intrinsically linked to the family's overarching emotional climate. The successful management of these tensions promotes the well-being of all members; failure to do so is strongly associated with health complaints and psychological symptoms.

Because family systems contain many subsystems and are part of a larger social context, fathering cannot be studied in isolation.

Family Systems: Where Do Fathers Fit?

Viewed from a systems perspective, fathers are just one part of the family system and their behavior is, in part, governed by that system—i.e., the result of family processes. Some systems encourage "good" fathering (and mothering); others do not. Generally, if the balance between separateness and connectedness in the system leads it to dysfunction, then fathering will be dysfunctional as well.

Families, at an extreme, may encourage separateness at the expense of connectedness, or encourage connectedness at the expense of separateness. Unfortunately, the reality is much more complex, as families are not so easily categorized. Clearly, though, because family systems contain many subsystems and are part of a larger social context, fathering cannot be studied in isolation.

"Youth Ratings of Role Performance of Resident and Nonresident Fathers: A First Look at NLSY97"

Discussants: Lynda Clarke, Center for Population Studies, London, England
James Davis, Temple University

Authors: Alan Acock, Oregon State University
Randal Day, Brigham Young University

Moderator: Henry Hitz, Bay Area Male Involvement Network (BAMIN)

Alan Acock and Randal Day suggest that a greater understanding of youth perceptions of father involvement may lead to better intervention strategies designed to increase effective father involvement in children's lives. Their study explores how young adolescents perceive their fathers' role performance. The study attempts to compare perceived performance of fathers who are biological and nonbiological, resident and nonresident, and addresses differences in perceptions across racial/ethnic groups.

Father Involvement. Research has shown that the role attributed to the father has changed dramatically over the past 150 years, from that of a moral guide responsible for teaching religious ideals to more of a nurturer whose role is less gender-determined and more multifaceted. As fathers' roles have changed, so have the research models—moving from a deficit model (i.e., investigating the effects of the father's absence) to a more proactive model focused on the various activities that equate with positive father involvement. Research suggests that an increase in these fatherly activities also increases child well-being.

Research About Teen Perception of Parents. Research on the topic of father-teen relationships is quite limited, mainly focused on levels of communication. No objective measure of actual father performance yet exists; however, studies suggest that youths' perception of parental performance has a strong influence on their development and well-being.

Methodology and Findings

Acock and Randal's study employs the NLSY97, a nationally representative survey for which 8,984 adolescents aged 12 to 18 were interviewed. The authors restricted their sample to youth aged 12 to 14 at the time of the interview who were Hispanic, non-Hispanic African American, or non-Hispanic white; had contact with the nonresident father (if applicable); or lived with both biological parents or a mother who did or did not have a new spouse/partner.

The authors' study presents the mean responses to 14 items seen as broadly representing a youth's perception of how well his or her father performs his role. Four types of fathers were studied: (1) biological fathers in two-biological-parent families; (2) nonresident biological fathers whose child lives with the mother and there is no new spouse/partner; (3) nonresident fathers whose child lives with the mother who has a new spouse/partner; and (4) a new spouse/partner who serves as a father/father figure but is not the child's biological father. For most of the items a higher mean reflects a better rating, except in the cases of "father is unsupportive" and "father makes plans, then cancels them," for which a higher score reflects a more negative evaluation.

A greater understanding of youth perceptions of father involvement may lead to better intervention strategies that increase actual effective father involvement in children's lives.

Resident and Nonresident Biological Parents. Overall, biological fathers in the families with two biological parents received the best ratings on nearly all items, although not every comparison was statistically significant.

When comparing biological fathers in two-biological-parent families to biological nonresident fathers when the mother has no new spouse/partner, the study revealed:

- Nonresident fathers know significantly less about their child's teacher and school activities. The mean for the resident biological father is 2.34 compared to means of 1.27 and 1.17 for nonresident biological fathers.
- Resident biological fathers have a significantly lower (more favorable) mean (.55 on a 0 to 4 scale, where 0 represents never) for making plans and then canceling them than do nonresident fathers.
- Resident biological fathers are seen as both significantly more likely to praise their child and as more critical of their children than nonresident biological fathers.
- Youths seek to emulate their resident biological fathers and think highly of them. For adolescents with residential biological fathers, the mean was 2.73 on the item, "youth wants to be like father," translating as between "sometimes" and "usually." In contrast, the nonresident biological father mean was 1.83, meaning between "rarely" and "sometimes."

Ratings of Biological Father When the Mother Has a New Spouse/Partner. The study compared how youth rated their nonresident biological father when the child and the mother live alone and when they live with a new spouse/partner. Remarkably, the results show no statistically significant difference in how the nonresident biological father is rated on the 14 performance criteria.

Apparently, early adolescent youth view their nonresident biological father about the same whether or not their mother has a new spouse/partner.

The Role Performance of Nonbiological Father/ Father Figures. Nonbiological resident fathers/father figures generally scored lower than resident biological fathers in almost all comparisons, but better than nonresident biological fathers. Thus, the father's residency seems to be the more important criterion in how a young teen rates him than whether he is the biological parent.

Racial/Ethnic Differences. Acock and Day noticed statistically significant differences in youth ratings of resident, biological fathers among the three racial/ethnic groups for all but one of the 14 items. However, there was more variance within each racial/ethnic group than between them. Hispanic youths rate their fathers low on their knowledge of their teacher and school activities. In addition, fathers of African American youth were at a constant disadvantage. They received low (unfavorable) ratings when youth were asked if they think highly of their father, want to be like their father, enjoy time with their father, and whether their father knows their friends, knows their friends' parents, and who the child is with. These fathers were rated highest (again, unfavorably) in terms of being strict, being unsupportive, and canceling plans.

A father's residency seems to be more important in how a young teen rates him than whether or not he is the biological parent.

The study found no real systematic racial/ethnic difference in the youths' rating of resident nonbiological fathers/ father figures, nor in their rating of nonresident biological fathers in those families where the mother lives with a new spouse/partner. However, in mean ratings of nonresident biological fathers, all but one item showed a statistically significant difference in families where the mother does not have a new spouse/partner. In particular, African American youth have a worse view of their biological fathers' role performance than do white youth. Here, Hispanic youth rate their biological fathers lowest on knowledge of friends, their parents, and teacher and school activities.

From these preliminary findings, the authors surmise that, contrary to popular belief, the relationship between nonresident biological fathers and adolescents does not necessarily suffer or disintegrate when the mother lives with a new spouse/partner—though resident nonbiological fathers receive higher ratings on most aspects of role performance than nonresident biological fathers. They are most concerned about lack of positive involvement along racial and ethnic lines in terms of a father's ability to serve as a role model to adolescents, given the increasing influence of peers and school at this age. Thus, they suggest that mothers and teachers find ways to engage the father in this arena.

The relationship between nonresident biological fathers and adolescents does not necessarily suffer or disintegrate when the mother lives with a new spouse/partner.

Current and Emerging Issues in Fathering and Family Processes

Based on the research presented in the four Study Group papers, Roundtable participants identified a number of key topics regarding the role of fathering and family processes in children's outcomes. Summarized here, they include the following: (1) conceptual and analytical "intersections" in the study of fathering and family processes; (2) nonesssential, essential, and additive notions of fatherhood; (3) the field's shift in emphasis from family structure to family processes; (4) notions of family goals and culture; (5) definitions of family that consider contextual issues and relationships; (6) the value of nonresident fathers; (7) the impact of stepfamilies; (8) gender roles and power dynamics; (9) cultural, class, and racial factors; and (10) the use of family systems theory as a conceptual framework.

Locating the Intersections

Roundtable participants concurred that when discussing and researching the impact of fathering and family processes on children's psychological, social, and economic outcomes—and when pursuing family research in general—it is critical to explore a number of conceptual and analytical "intersections."

Examples they cited include the links between research, outreach, and advocacy; research, policy, and practice; quantitative and qualitative methodologies; and connections among family members' perceptions of their lives and relationships, other family members' assessments, and objective measures or observations. One specific suggestion was that both quantitative and qualitative research be undertaken to examine the concordance or discordance of family reports of an individual family member's perceptions and outcomes.

Exploring Nonessential, Essential, and Additive Notions of Fatherhood

Does a father-child relationship confer additional advantages in terms of a child's well-being? The central issue in current discussions of family processes and family life has been an increasing focus on the meaning and relevance of the father's role within families, and in a child's outcomes. The question has become: Is "fatherhood" an essential component of the family—one that is necessary to produce positive child outcomes? This essentialist argument is controversial, and Randal Day of Brigham Young University enumerated a number of approaches to addressing it:

It is important to identify our assumptions on the role of fathers in child development and family well-being. Each approach has a different, but equally significant, impact on recommendations for what a father should, could, or would do to make a unique contribution to the health and well-being of his family.

1. Some scholars, policymakers, and practitioners believe that fathers are not essential for promoting family and child well-being—neither as a premise nor a presence.

2. Others believe that fathers are important, but not essential, elements of the family. According to this additive model, it does not matter who accomplishes the fathering task—assuming that mothers or other family members (male or female) are capable of shouldering or sharing the responsibilities traditionally related to fathering.

3. One essentialist argument holds that there are "mother templates" and "father templates" that are necessary for family well-being—that mothers and fathers by nature do and should

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assume separate roles. One commonly cited problem with this model is that it creates idealized expectations which few—perhaps no—mothers or fathers could fully achieve.

4. Another essentialist model argues that fathers do contribute something unique and special to a child's life, but that they are not necessarily needed for that child to become a well-adjusted and productive adult.

5. The fifth model relates to what Day called "the glow factor"—a "systemic" notion that when a man and woman marry and form a family unit, they create a greater whole that contributes essential and unsubstitutable elements to childrearing and development.

A number of participants suggested that it is important for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to identify clearly their assumptions regarding these various positions on the role of fathers in child development and family well-being. Each approach has a different, but equally significant, impact on recommendations for what a father should, could, or would do to make a unique contribution to the health and well-being of his family. In addition, when considering the validity of these approaches, the approaches must be applied and made relevant to the role of fathers in all settings, among all socioeconomic backgrounds, and within all racial and ethnic groups.

Family scholars have recently begun to realize that, in many cases, structural issues indicate a change in family mechanisms and dynamics.

Graduating from Structure to Process

In addition to arguing the sometimes competing stances of essentialist and additive models, many in the family studies field have been debating the relevance of family structures versus family processes. Family scholars have recently begun to realize that, in many cases, structural issues indicate a change in family mechanisms and dynamics, and that they had overlooked the role of processes within the family in influencing adolescent behavior. This area of the field, participants agreed, is simply not well-developed.

As Day explained, a number of approaches can be used to help basic and policy-related research to move beyond structural assumptions to examining shifts in outcomes due to family processes:

1. ***Families as Systems.*** Families themselves can be examined from a systemic perspective—as an entity with shared values and outcomes. It then becomes possible to look at shared variances and overlaps in the experiences and outcomes of individual members of a family unit, as well as to compare individual experiences to those of the family as a whole.

2. ***Families and Goal-Directed Behaviors.*** When considering the family as an entity with collective goals, one can frame family processes as strategies used to achieve those shared goals. In this context, critical research questions would center on quantifying how individual members, and the family as a unit, pursue these goals—particularly when most processes are covert, subtle, and not "contractual."

3. ***Gendered Relationships within Families.*** When studying family processes and strategies, it is also important to examine how these approaches are constructed and used differently by male and female parents. Are they also applied differentially for children of different genders?

4. ***Families and Social Capital.*** Widely used in the sociology and demography fields, social capital theory argues that it is possible to understand the outcomes of children better if we understand the social measures and strategies families use to achieve their goals. In particular, many believe that families with a

high level of "social competence" are particularly successful and deliberate in imparting those values and strategies to their children. Day believes it would be interesting to examine the effect of these strategies on a child who has made a successful transition to adulthood, not just in cases in which "problem behaviors" are exhibited.

Eloise Anderson of the Claremont Institute cited race as a good example of a structural variable that does not necessarily map onto family processes. "Many conflicts within the family are not around 'race' per se," Anderson said, "but around cultural battles: Recent immigrant families may not have shared family processes yet, simply because new cultures are still being formed within the family to deal with acculturation."

When considering the family as an entity with collective goals, one can frame family processes as strategies used to achieve those shared goals.

Extending Notions of Family Goals and Culture

Considerable debate has taken place around the nature of family goals, their role in childrearing, and their ability to influence the outcomes of children. And while it may be difficult to assess a family's actual pursuit of shared goals, the degree of ideological emphasis the family places on various values such as education, economic mobility, or religious beliefs is often evident.

A difference exists as well between the notions of compelling family processes (defined as strategies and behaviors) and paradigmatic shared goals (defined as desired outcomes that drive processes and beliefs). According to Day, "These shared goals act as a compass for the group. They represent shared notions, not just one person's goals in the family."

In addition, he noted that it is often difficult to determine which member(s) of the family directs those goals, the extent to which they are being adopted by children, and the extent to which they are adopted by a parent who did not initiate the goals. However, Day believes it is acceptable for researchers and others to extrapolate the nature of a family's set of shared goals even if they are not explicitly stated. "You can assume that a family would devise strategies to achieve goals. If the strategies are apparent, I think you can then infer what the goal is," he argued.

Day believes that the family studies field needs to explore the phenomenon of "subscription"—the degree to which a child or other family member adopts and pursues certain shared goals. This line of inquiry will be particularly compelling if studies can track a child as he or she ages and determine when and if the child decides to abandon or adhere to the ideological direction laid out by a parent or both parents. He also divided the concept of shared goals into categories related to structural measures—whether the goals are open, closed, or random—as well as whether they represent thematic ideologies or beliefs, particularly in areas such as religion and education.

A consideration of culture requires awareness of the ways in which culture impacts fatherhood. One participant suggested, "We are setting up families for failure in our own work if we think of all of them as the same."

Kathy Reich of the Social Policy Action Network suggested that family goals can be further divided into two categories: (1) goals related to the childrearing process; and (2) goals related to the definition of success for the child. Charles Partridge of The Ohio State University added that, in addition to identifying, through qualitative means, a family's multiple shared goals, a preliminary quantitative measure could capture the degree to which each member of the family agrees on those goals, as well as the extent to which family processes themselves are goal-directed.

Regardless of the definition or approach used when measuring goals and strategies, two important considerations apply. It is important to note that goals may be domain-specific—shared in areas such as religion or employment,

but different in terms of dating, friendships, and education, for example—and to identify which domain-specific goals are relevant for examining each type of outcome being measured.

Another participant suggested that—in all cases—a distinction should be made between immediate goals and idealized aspirations, particularly as it relates to the family's socioeconomic status and geographical location. For example, a low-income family or individuals within the family may aspire to send a particularly high-achieving child to an Ivy League institution, while that family's more immediate goal is simply to ensure that all family members have enough to eat on any given day.

Defining the Family Through Contextual Issues and Relationships

A number of participants questioned the assumptions of many researchers and policymakers about the structural definition of the family and the consistency of goals and processes across cultural, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic categories. In particular, they mentioned that a consideration of culture requires awareness of the ways in which culture influences fatherhood, as well as how culture is constructed and race/ethnicity distinguished from these definitions of culture. As Anderson suggested, "We are setting up families for failure in our own work if we think of all of them as the same."

Geraldo Rodriguez of Los Angeles County Community and Senior Services observed that fundamental questions were being raised—including what the term "family" actually means, particularly within different ethnic/racial and cultural contexts. "What is the relevance of the term 'nuclear' or 'extended' families for different groups?" he asked. "What is one group's tendency to allow different definitions of parents beyond the biological compared to another's? These very fundamental issues have substantial impacts on how observers or intervention teams frame the answers to their questions, or design their approaches to services."

Such a questioning of the fundamental definition of who comprises a family covers configurations ranging from grandparents as sole caregivers to same-sex parents to foster families, among others.

Are familial forms, tasks, and functions universal, or are they inherently influenced by culturally transmitted norms and traditions—whether established or emerging? While one participant asserted that it must be possible to define some universal principles that transcend race, culture, and socioeconomic status, others did not agree. Greer Litton Fox of the National Council on Family Relations and the University of Tennessee cautioned, "We need to keep ourselves complicated [....We] do our work a disservice if we try to oversimplify or deny the impact of context." Participants discussed a number of relevant areas that required refined definitions or overdue attention: nonresidential fathers and their role in family processes; how stepfamilies shift familial processes; how gender and power are ascribed and expressed in different types of families; and which specific issues should be considered regarding class and race/ethnicity.

The definition of "family" needs to be extended to include nonresidential fathers, because individual family members can profoundly shape family systems and behaviors—even when that individual is not "present" in the way this status has been traditionally defined.

Including Nonresidential Fathers

The field of family studies has traditionally ignored the role and/or contributions of nonresidential parents, particularly fathers. In considering the contextual issues raised in the discussion, a number of participants believed that the definition of "family" needed to be extended to include nonresidential fathers in studies, interventions, and policy considerations.

As Maureen Waller of the Public Policy Institute of California mentioned, individual family members can profoundly shape family systems and behaviors—even when that individual is not "present"

in the way this status has been traditionally defined. Given that, more so now than in the past, fathering is being modeled in many families in terms of paternal nurturance—the potential impact of a nonresident father on a child's psychological, social, and economic outcomes can become lost in research, practice, and policy geared toward one system of fathering or notion of fatherhood.

For example, it is a widely held assumption among practitioners and policymakers that mothers often act as gatekeepers who distance noncustodial fathers from the lives of their children. However, the field requires empirical information that explores this issue, addressing, among other concerns, how likely it would be for a noncustodial father to remain involved with his children if the gatekeeping was eliminated, and what type of impact this involvement would have. As well, the specific nature of that impact would likely depend on a number of contextual factors, such as the health of the relationship between parents, extent of geographic separation, and constraints on fathers' time.

Acknowledging Stepfamilies

Stepfamilies represent another rarely considered and understudied structural configuration in the field of fathers and families. According to William Marsiglio of the University of Florida, "Stepfamilies seem to play out as having a separate agenda than a child's family of origin, but they do have a distinct impact on relationships and intimacies. And the circumstances of the family have a great deal to do with a child's ultimate definitions and constructions of the family."

A child's transition from one family to another through remarriage or a parent's residing with an unmarried partner has a significant impact on the child's development, in terms of adjustment and differences in power. It is imperative that the field begin to examine and discuss how the formation of new family configurations is manifested in family processes, particularly in terms of the expectations, rights, and obligations of the family's various members.

As Anderson and others suggested, family members should also be defined to include the nonresident parent and that parent's potentially new family configuration. Anderson asked: "How do we conceptualize family processes in families where one or both separated parents have formed new relationships? What if that relationship is with a parent who has his or her own children? What happens when new children are introduced? Are children from the previous relationship excluded? Are new children given preference? Are new triads created?" Answers to these and other questions can help us to formulate how stepfamily configurations fit into existing family systems approaches, as well as to create a theoretical definition of family subsystems/stepfamilies and examine how they are formed and managed.

Stepfamilies represent another rarely considered and understudied family structure. How do we conceptualize family processes in families where one or both separated parents have formed new relationships?

Understanding Gender Roles and Power Dynamics

The role of gender in influencing how children are raised and treated, what types of relationships they form, and how gender itself affects family processes require greater attention. In this area, participants suggested that distinguishing between essentialist and nonessentialist constructions of gender and gender roles will be a critical, though difficult, task for family researchers to address.

The impact of various dyadic relationships formed between and among family members according to gender has also been too long ignored, including those between father and daughter or father and mother. The gender of children and how gender plays out in famil-

ial relationships and roles is critical in understanding how to engage fathers and how study results should be interpreted.

As Marsiglio mentioned, "Power is an unignorable issue in this area, particularly when talking about gendered roles in family processes." Admittedly, such an acknowledgment complicates research in this area, but a more complex conception of gender roles—in terms of how power is taken, granted, and distributed among family members—can lead to a deeper understanding of how family processes affect child outcomes.

Incorporating Culture, Class, and Race

Suzanne Bartle-Haring believes that, in order for families to be functional, they must be able to function in their immediate environments—that each family unit will have to adapt to its own set of cultural, economic, and social circumstances. Philip Bowman of the University of Illinois added that distinguishing between the notion of culture and race/ethnicity also requires deconstructing the concept of "race" itself. As he explained, "Race is a complex metaphor to pull apart. Looking at the social and political dimensions of inequality (socioeconomic and cultural), differences are confounded in the construct of race."

The gender of children and how gender plays out in familial relationships and roles is critical in understanding how to engage fathers and how study results should be interpreted.

For example, when comparing white, Hispanic, and African American fathers, rates of father absence vary as widely as rates of supplying economic support. However, the reasons for these fathers' absence or their lack of support may be very different depending on the community to which they belong. Rather than constructing fathers' failure to take responsibility for their children as a sign of personal shortcomings, such deficiencies could also be viewed as a function of the unique nature of the conditions in which an ethnic or racial group lives. The collection and use of quantitative data on the types of families being studied would be helpful in determining both the causes and perceptions of fathers' participation, and represent a responsible approach to research, policymaking, and practice in this area.

Using Family Systems Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Examining Family Processes

Family systems theory allows the field to explore how fathering influences and becomes influenced by a family system. Bartle-Haring believes that importing this model into the family studies field provides a helpful framework and conceptual starting point. She believes it helps to inform the study of family processes by looking at the family as an entity, providing for shared variances and the ability to look at relationships between individuals within the system.

To understand family processes using the system as a framework, Bartle-Haring suggested that it is first important to identify all tasks as well as interactive patterns within a family unit. The framework can then be applied to foster an understanding of family processes toward achieving goals, using family patterns as representations of processes.

Bartle-Haring also believes that family systems theory reverses the tendency to place blame solely on a father because it contends that it is the family system itself that "creates" a father—whether it is lessons about fatherhood he learned from his family of origin, or those he developed as a father in his current family. The same can be said for mothers. In other words, a dysfunctional system will create dysfunctional dads—and possibly dysfunctional moms. On the other hand, family systems theory also allows an examination of an individual's role in changing that system or breaking its cycles. Finally, it also aids in discussing how fathering is defined—whether it is construed as being unique from mothering or whether the roles are considered to be interchangeable.

Directions for Research

Participants discussed new avenues for scholarly research in the field of fathers and family processes. These areas include: (1) relating research directly to policy and practice; (2) determining whether and how fathers matter; (3) "biological" versus "social" father-child relationships; (4) linking qualitative and quantitative research; (5) fresh approaches to statistical analyses; (6) viewing perceptions as outcomes, not merely inputs; (7) capturing the various contexts in which family processes occur; and (8) intervention evaluation.

Relating Research Directly to Policy and Practice

Roundtable participants suggested that because findings from family studies research have a direct link to policymaking and practice, such studies should be conceived and implemented to consider how data can be applied to policymaking, program development, and clinical work. As Gavazzi noted, "We need to conceptualize what our research is informing in a different way, by bridging the gap between prevention and intervention, as well as build on family strengths."

Identifying the quality as well as the nature of the father-child relationship is a critical area of inquiry.

In general, researchers also need to ensure that the theories they develop are both rigorous and capable of being implemented into programs. "Theoretical notions of social capital and family processes are not pushed as much as they need to be to become relevant in this area," said Day. "The implications of our findings and our recommendations will be far more powerful if they are informed by a theoretical base."

For example, research exploring why nonresident parents so seldom participate in family interventions might also ultimately be applied to increase father participation. Studies show that, in two-parent households, participation in an intervention is 80 percent, while in families where one parent is nonresident, participation levels drop to 5 percent. Uncovering the reasons for that difference could lead to conclusions about how programs might substantially increase participation if programs were geared specifically toward these nonresident parents.

It is important to determine whether it is father contact itself or the quality of that contact that exerts the greatest impact.

Determining Whether and How Fathers Matter

Participants discussed the utility of statistical analyses in assessing the validity of different points of view regarding whether fathers play an essential, additive, or nonessential role in promoting child outcomes. Day and Acock stated that researchers can benefit from working with statistical models, such as the ones they adopted, along with a growing set of surveys that include measures of parenting variables and child outcomes. Acock noted that these tools allow one to "look at father criticism versus [lack of] criticism in light of child outcomes and compare and contrast mothers' and fathers' partnering processes." Findings from such comparisons would also be tremendously helpful in informing the political debate on fathers.

Citing research on the notion of "possible selves," Vivian Gadsden of NCOFF added that a father's public statement about bonding and his availability to children may not translate into actual

behavior. "Even if he has a desire to do so—there is a host of other issues that militate against 'good parenting' so that ideal images don't necessarily translate into actual relationships."

Thus, a critical question underlying this entire area of inquiry is determining whether and how fathers' care itself matters. A collateral question requires asking when and how fathers are present. While it is difficult to determine how to capture these dynamics, participants believed that both quantitative and qualitative research in family studies must be pursued to help uncover what it is about fathers' presence and role that influences family and child outcomes.

As Lynda Clarke of the Centre for Population Studies suggested, it would be helpful to develop a consistent set of family processes against which to compare different types of fathers, or to establish measures of fathers according to the nature of their relationship with their children. For example, researchers could compare nonresidential and residential fathers as to the quality of the relationships they maintain with their children, answering questions such as: How secure or insecure is the relationship? What is the extent of father-child emotional attachment?

Part of an examination of the "essential" quality of whether and how fathers matter should entail determining the nature of differences—if any—between a child's relationship with a "biological" versus a "social" father.

In addition, comparing the fathering roles and processes of residential biological fathers versus residential nonbiological fathers would be helpful in determining the validity of a variety of essentialist notions about fatherhood. One participant cautioned, however, that researchers using quantitative data to examine this issue must be careful to determine whether a residential male does in fact serve in a fathering role—not every man living with a mother will necessarily be a father-figure for her children.

Indeed, one problem with quantitative data on a father's relationship with his child is that researchers often do not know how long the resident male has been in a child's life, nor the extent of his relationship with that child. Whereas, when a resident male is called "stepfather," the moniker is a sure signal to researchers that the respondent is serving in the role of father. Comparisons of resident or nonresident fathers or father-figures, married or cohabiting, should include measures such as geographical distance between father and child, duration of their separation (if applicable), and the dynamics of the father-child relationship.

Identifying the quality as well as the nature of the father-child relationship is a critical area of inquiry as well. "We know that whether youth have contact with their fathers is an important variable contributing to their outcomes. But we need to better understand the meaning of that contact," said James Davis of Temple University. As many participants noted, it is important to determine whether it is the contact itself or the quality of that contact that exerts the greatest impact.

Understanding "Biological" and "Social" Father-Child Relationships

Participants argued that part of an examination of the "essential" quality of whether and how fathers matter should entail determining the nature of differences—if any—between a child's relationship with a "biological" versus a "social" father. As Marsiglio noted, "We often focus on the social aspects of fatherhood, but it may be possible that a father can have a connection with his children that is analogous to the biological connection that many claim mothers have with their infants." While participants agreed that such an area of research will be difficult to conceptualize and implement, they also concurred that it was a pursuit worth investigating.

Geraldo Rodriguez believes that the best way to frame the issue is not just "to

examine biological connections, but connections, period"—particularly in terms of father absence: the level of physical remoteness from a child and its impact on outcomes. Gavazzi added that there seems to be something important or special about the biological parent-child relationship, even if only in terms of perception. "We need to look at the generativity issue as well, from the perspective of the parent, and what type of bond they forge with biological offspring versus nonbiological children."

To gain a different perspective, it is important not to overlook children who have no relationship with their noncustodial biological fathers; simply because a child does not have contact with his biological father does not mean he has no male role model or will necessarily have problems due to his father's absence. Roundtable participants were reminded that researchers must locate within race and culture how extended-family arrangements that include grandfathers, as well as other household configurations, are structured, and examine the effects of other such "social fathers" (male role models) beyond the traditional "custodial" model.

Simply because a child does not have contact with his biological father does not mean he has no male role model, or will necessarily have problems due to his father's absence.

Linking Qualitative and Quantitative Research

Roundtable participants discussed how family studies researchers can use qualitative and quantitative data to design research methodologies and interpret findings. For example, researchers can begin their work by using qualitative research to determine which items are relevant to include on a quantitative data-collection protocol. Or, they might use a national data set to provide a set of baseline statistics on a particular population of respondents before designing sets of questions that prompt program staff and practitioners to answer qualitatively. In both cases, researchers can use combined qualitative and quantitative approaches to test, refine, and compare their approaches and results.

For example, when collecting a small data set, researchers might identify both specific types of information to be collected about family members and areas for observations that would help them tap into family processes. For collecting large data sets, on the other hand, such observations are not feasible. According to Bowman, the challenge in performing research in family studies is to converge large national data sets and data from local community efforts. "The benefit of national data is the representativeness they provide, allowing researchers to identify where the risks are in particular social ecologies and contrast them systematically with one another," he explained. According to Bowman, the benefits also involve the number of observations available, the diversity of families captured, geographic areas represented, and family structures included. But he recommended that researchers combine national data with qualitative community studies in a complementary manner, using the former to locate the latter. Qualitative studies allow comparisons of different types of communities along similar dimensions, using national data as the unifying element. Because context is so important, it creates variables that must be considered when developing programs.

Researchers must locate within race and culture how extended-family arrangements that include grandfathers, as well as other household configurations, are structured.

As Gavazzi said, "Ultimately, what the Study Group heard from the Roundtable is that we require a both/and approach—one type of inquiry does not preclude the other, and it is more an emphasis on asking families in programs and certain settings to help us flesh out data in a national sample." In the same way, researchers can work with practitioners to identify other influential figures in a family, about whom they would otherwise not have knowledge.

Marsiglio suggested a process for evaluating fathers using quantitative and qualitative data. Researchers could begin their investigations with observational data, and then query children to determine points of comparison. They could, for example, observe fathers' behavior, ask children to describe their perceptions of that behavior, and then situate those findings in other research or information on mother-father relationships, the behavior of other fathers from similar families and cultures, broader social images related to race/ethnicity and class, and within other culturally-specific representations of fatherhood.

Researchers might also incorporate multiple reports about qualitative information into the interpretation of quantitative data. For example they can use both parent and child respondents as resources to help identify which familial inputs lead to good outcomes. Reports from multiple family members are ideal, as they can clarify where family members' perceptions overlap. Overall, it is important for researchers to label clearly and carefully whether a finding is based on a family member's perception of processes or an observer's perceptions. Researchers could then use the overlapping items in a predictive model to examine outcomes.

The challenge in performing research in family studies is to converge large national data sets and data from local community efforts.

Anderson cautioned, however, that when gathering qualitative information researchers must bear in mind many factors that can influence the reports they receive: Respondents' perception of the researchers' differences in terms of class, age, race, or other characteristics can influence their level of trust as well as their truthfulness in responding. The style of interview itself—a researcher's comportment as well as the questions asked—may skew the responses. "Your words might not be theirs," warned Anderson. "They could have different definitions of terms you take for granted." It is always important to keep in mind the implications of variations in race, ethnicity, and culture between observer and observed.

In addition, many researchers conduct interviews "cold," failing to establish relationships with the respondents or program participants beforehand. Litton Fox suggested that researchers lay more groundwork by spending time with respondents, reinforcing direct connections with them. She also noted that practitioners and policymakers should trust that qualitative researchers who take the time to become familiar with respondents will be able to narrate the lives of their subjects in an objective and accurate way. As Anderson commented, "It is why working with practitioners in performing this research is so important. As is understanding that receiving information from different actors—even teachers and administrators and members of an extended family—will help you better discern what is objectively occurring." Thus, researchers can confidently take cues from program facilitators and other practitioners who regularly serve as observers of family processes and behavior indicators in the individuals being studied. Their input will help to increase the reliability of predictors.

Considering New Directions in Statistical Analyses

Many participants had specific suggestions for improving the construction of statistical models that attempt to determine causality or associations between variables that represent family processes and those that represent family or child outcomes. Litton Fox suggested that it is only a matter of "adjusting the focus," the need to predict family processes as an intervening event in a child's life. Other participants cautioned about looking for indicators that have not been—or currently cannot be—measured directly. Such an analysis leads to inferred answers with the potential for substantial bias, they pointed out.

James Davis offered several suggestions: (1) perform multivariate analyses when examining family processes, because youth are nested within families, making hierarchical and analytic stratification particularly useful; (2) develop factor analysis scores or composites to increase the integrity of the findings and variables, since, in general, these models require more extensive theoretical work to generate a conceptual framework; and (3) ensure a more descriptive analysis is provided of the youth being studied, noting gender, race, geographic residence, socioeconomic status, and culture.

Studying Perceptions as Outcomes, Not Just Inputs

Davis noted that it is important for researchers to remember that child and parent perceptions of family processes do not represent actual performance or observed behaviors per se. Instead, they indicate how children view their parents, as well as how parents view their own role in the family and that of their children. Perceptions are important, but more in how they relate to the relationships that are formed and outcomes for individual family members, rather than their ability to represent "reality" or objective events and measures.

It is important for researchers to clearly and carefully label whether or not a finding is based on a family member's perception of processes or an observer's perceptions.

However, Lynda Clarke suggested that it is possible to consider family members' perceptions of family processes as outcomes in and of themselves. In other words, regardless of whether a family members' perceptions correlate with a more "objective" measure of behavior, the report of that perception has implications for interpreting and analyzing processes within a family. The impression that a father is authoritarian or domineering, despite the lack of observed behavior to support this characterization, may affect how a child behaves or views authority, or his or her assumptions about expectations for behavior.

Other participants mentioned the need to examine how family processes (and children's perceptions of their fathers) are influenced by forces external to the family, such as social norms and stereotypes, events, and incidents. As Anderson said, "When a child is with his father and they are stopped by a cop, how does that affect the kid's perception of the father's power? Especially when this is not just [a matter of] social status, but a security issue as well? A child sees the degree to which a father can exert power in society, and will most likely transfer that status to himself."

Often, researchers conduct interviews "cold," failing to establish relationships with the respondents or program participants beforehand.

Bowman reminded participants that researchers must assure that when discussing family members' perceptions they do not unwittingly insert their own assumptions and perceptions into the interpretation. "If we can't assume questions measure the same thing, if responses to the same question will be different from different groups, based on class, rage, age, ethnicity, then we must also acknowledge that their assumptions are all relevant to their answers."

Capturing the Context

While much emphasis is placed on research on "family processes" and their impact on child outcomes, there is little discussion of the relationship between other contextual variables and family processes themselves. Tom Rane of Washington State University noted that making more robust connections between the internal processes of families and the external forces influencing those processes will go a long way to informing policy debate and decision-making, as well as the design of interventions.

Waller suggested examining the effect of structural and cultural factors in shaping family processes, such as the prevailing tenets of the historical era; generational legacies; class/race/ethnicity; how fatherhood is encouraged or discouraged; and issues within the father's own family of origin. To help model interventions, in particular, it is also important to consider how various factors might influence what happens in families and to individuals; conditions in the neighborhood; the state of the schools; and the traditions, practices, and behaviors that affect how couples experience or construct fatherhood.

Researchers should also focus on gender roles and dynamics within the family, as only one component of internal and external forces impacting processes. They could examine how gender roles are constructed and consequently how research is conceptualized, policy made, and practice implemented with either implicit or explicit assumptions about the roles of mothers and fathers. They could also look at father-daughter and father-son dyads to examine fathers' perceived role differences in relationship to girls versus boys. In particular, Bartle-Haring suggested that the field needs research to examine how much and/or whether to distinguish between fathering and mothering.

It is possible to consider family members' perceptions of family processes as outcomes in and of themselves.

Race/ethnicity represents another contextual variable that requires more thorough, careful, and informed investigation. For example, when examining race in a quantitative analysis, it is important not just to compare across racial or ethnic categories but within them as well. According to Clarke, "In the aggregate, there are different types of family structures across these categories, so when discussing family processes, the findings from research will be more robust and the conclusions or recommendations more appropriate when comparing within cultures as much as possible." Those findings may enable researchers and others to differentiate the relative impact of such inputs as education, income, geographic location, and family structure. Davis also suggested examining the variations in perceptions of youths within racial categories, which may help to mitigate an emphasis on examining statistical differences across categories.

Evaluating Interventions

When considering how to design their own intervention evaluations, researchers can take a cue from Gavazzi's approach to the Growing Up FAST program. Gavazzi recommended that, after conducting a formative evaluation, researchers consider performing a retrospective analysis of factors for father participation and nonparticipation and building on that information to implement recruitment and retention protocols. He also suggested that researchers engage fathers, mothers, and stakeholders in focus groups to provide feedback on the father-specific module.

The impression that a father is authoritative or domineering, despite the lack of observed behavior to support this characterization, may affect how a child behaves or views authority.

For example, Rane proposed examining the "half-life" of a program. "A program may have 50 people at level one, and only 25 people at level two," he observed. "If you ask the dropouts questions, particularly about why they left, it will give different insights than just interviewing participants and nonparticipants."

One Roundtable participant commented that, for many programs, getting fathers even to show up represents a success. The problem of self-selection and bias are particularly important if researchers are relying upon participant interviews alone. Those participants who do engage programs may be those who recognize that something needs to be done; their presence likely indicates a sense of readiness to make a difference in their child's life.

Measuring Family Processes Using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97) represents the first time a wide variety of family-process variables have been measured in a comprehensive, longitudinal national data set involving both a parent and a youth as respondents. Day and Acock suggested that it represents a valuable means of analyzing the role of family processes in youth outcomes.

The NLSY97 is a national probability sample of 8,984 youths with a cross-sectional sample of 6,748 youths and a supplemental over-sample of 2,236 Hispanic and African American youths. In 1997, sets of two informants provided information on family process variables. A youth and one parent, usually the mother, were interviewed. Both also provided information about the other parent or parental figure, including resident, nonresident, biological or step parent.

The NLSY97 also contains robust measures of key resource variables and peer variables. As well, it also measures a series of family process variables. Resource variables include those at the family, neighborhood/community, and school levels, and monitor such predictors as parents' education/income and home/neighborhood safety and condition. Peer variables include reports by the youth about the attitudes, behavior and expectations of their peers. Of particular interest: the activities that peers model, both positive (percentage of peers engaging in school activities or volunteering) and negative (percentage of peers engaging in drugs or gang membership). Family process variables include parental monitoring, autonomy, control, limit setting and breaking, and parenting style.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implications for Policymaking

As participants discussed the impact of internal dynamics and external forces on family processes and outcomes, they identified a series of recommendations to help policymakers conceptualize appropriate interventions. This section provides an account of the results of their discussion.

The Roundtable's recommendations for policy included the following: (1) funding basic research and evaluations; (2) adding questions to national surveys such as the NLSY; (3) promoting involvement by noncustodial fathers; (4) considering intergenerationality and transitions; (5) creating a more inclusive concept of "family"; (6) recognizing the subjectivity of defining a "functional" versus "nonfunctional" family; and (7) determining the importance of father residency and nonresidency.

Funding Basic Research and Evaluations

Many participants stressed the importance for policymakers to promote an understanding of how nonbiological father figures serve a parental role in a child's life—particularly when considering priorities for funding research and program evaluations. Policymakers could also reconsider how to promote and support research efforts that go out into the community and ask fathers themselves which factors would encourage their participation in programs, as well as what it is that programs, children, and mothers value about the involvement of fathers in their families' lives. Policymaking could also target funding toward research that collects information on perceptions and expectations of practitioners as to whether to welcome fathers into their programs.

Policymakers should support research efforts that go out into the community and ask fathers themselves which factors would encourage their participation in programs.

In addition, policymakers should reconsider the commonly held notion that only "professionals" can intervene appropriately in family processes. One participant suggested that policy can work with research and practice to understand how best to train neighborhood residents to work with interventions and within the community. Practitioners might ask themselves: To whom in the community do we want to transfer our skills? How could we ensure that community practitioners maintain and upgrade their skills on a long-term basis? The fathers and families field is an emerging area of study, policymaking, and practice, so it is an ideal setting for considering new models in practice as well as research.

Many policy interventions are geared toward the norms and values of white, married, middle-class families. We need to account for differences along power/gender lines in family roles, and for inequalities in terms of class, culture, and race.

Adding Father-Related Questions to National Surveys

Policymakers can help promote the addition of critical items to national surveys that would help advance family and father research. They could facilitate the ability to identify census tracking data, obtain information about neighborhoods, and safety.

Promoting Noncustodial Father Involvement

Responsible fatherhood is a proven, measured, and key variable in mitigating negative outcomes for children and in strengthening fragile families. Policy can play a significant role in promoting such responsible involvement, from supporting positive fathering processes to incorporating strategies for co-parenting into major initiatives and program requirements. However, given the current emphasis on marriage in political debates, it is important that policy continue to promote involvement of fathers regardless of marital status.

Considering Intergenerationality and Role Transitions

Policymakers can also incorporate a more intensive examination of the intergenerational transfer of skills, knowledge, behavior, and role expectations into the research agendas they fund, as well as ensure that these findings are both informed by and inform practice. In particular, they can work to increase the investigation of how such skills, knowledge, and behavior are transmitted, negotiated, and transformed from generation to generation, both within certain geographic locations and at the individual level.

Policymakers could also sponsor research on role transitions—from nonparent to father or mother or from adolescent parent to adult parent—focusing on the culturally specific roles and expectations that result.

Defining the Family

There is perhaps no better place to broaden the notion of how the family is defined than at the public policy level, in conjunction with definitions developed with researchers. Policymakers can help to spur research and national, state, or local conversations that result in a redefinition of the family itself, one that accounts for the variety of family structures that exist in various communities. Such investigations could address questions such as: What is the family theoretically? Practically? What constitutes a family? Are residence, biology, or roles the defining elements?

Remembering that One Family Type Does Not Fit All

Policymakers can also help to mitigate problems that arise from making value judgments when defining "functional" versus "nonfunctional" families, in which values and visions are or are not shared. The issue may be not so much that goals are not shared within a family, but that insufficient resources exist to support good working relationships between parents, or between parents and children. In such cases, appropriate interventions should take into consideration that structural issues make it more difficult to achieve goals through certain processes, rather than that family processes themselves can be blamed for negative outcomes.

It is up to policymakers to ensure that the field of family studies is using appropriate and consistent terms to describe dyadic relationships.

As Clarke mentioned, many policy interventions are geared toward the norms and values of white, married, middle-class families. A need exists to account for differences along power/gender lines in family roles, and for inequalities in terms of class, culture, and race. This is particularly true since families increasingly contain children of biracial or multiracial heritage; this will require a reconfiguration of the notion of race. What common stratifiers can be used to represent racial and ethnic categories in the future? To represent a shared culture? What is the role of policy in refining definitions of culture?

Pinpointing the Importance of Residency and Nonresidency

Research presented at the Roundtable found that youth ratings of fathers' performance are highest for biological fathers, while nonresidential fathers receive lower ratings. Clearly, residence matters. However, what is unclear is what is driving these lower ratings—whether it is simply the perception caused by nonresidence that fathers are less involved or whether there is something inherent or particular about nonresidence that interferes with the father-child relationship. Is it simply access to the child that influences this opinion? Policymakers can foster research that examines this question as well as is sensitive to other indicators—whether they pertain to the relationship itself or other barriers that limit fathers' participation in their children's lives. Policymakers could also focus on school-based and other institutional structures within the social services and educational systems that explicitly or implicitly eliminate the nonresident father's participation.

In addition, while researchers are considering adolescent outcomes in terms of dyadic relationships, it is up to policymakers to ensure that the field of family studies is using appropriate and consistent terms to describe those relationships: whether it is with a biological, resident parent (married versus cohabiting, unmarried); a biological, nonresident parent; or a nonbiological stepfather or father-figure (cohabiting or nonresident).

Lessons for Practice

During their discussion, participants identified a series of lessons for educators, practitioners, and program designers. Their recommendations include: (1) differentiating between mood disorders and delinquency in youth; (2) promoting caretaking by fathers; (3) facilitating concordance between mother and father regarding family goals; (4) not overlooking mothers when focusing on fathering issues; (5) proactively promoting father involvement in programs; (6) assisting families to verbalize their processes better; and (7) helping researchers to link qualitative and quantitative studies.

Practitioners can help clarify the overlaps and distinctions between clinical categories regarding mood disorders and legal categories such as "delinquency" and "juvenile offender."

Differentiating Between Mood Disorders and Delinquency

"There are no juvenile delinquents in Providence," quipped Bowman, referring to an inherent inequity in the ways in which behavioral problems are screened and assigned in different family contexts and configurations. Practitioners can help make clear the overlaps and distinctions between clinical categories regarding mood disorders and legal categories such as "delinquency" and "juvenile offender." These distinctions, as they play out in different social ecologies, are of particular importance because the co-occurrence of what is considered "good behavior" is context-specific. Practitioners can help both researchers and policymakers to understand the different contexts in which diagnoses take place, as well as the implications for different intervention approaches.

Promoting Fathers' Caretaking Through Interventions

Many practitioners maintain the implicit assumption that fathers' perceived role is disconnected from caretaking. In some ways, this misperception relates to traditional notions and a father's own perception that caretaking is not his primary role, although it may be at the heart of what can get him involved with his children. Interventions—as well as the research that supports and the policy that promotes them—must address this misperception. Such an examination requires a clarification of the impediments and culturally loaded barriers and issues facing fathers, which practitioners themselves could help identify.

Facilitating Mother-Father Concordance on Family Goals

Research has established the critical influence on child outcomes of father and mother concordance on parenting goals and processes, particularly in cases marked by mood disorders and delinquency. This area is essential to address in fathering and parenting programs.

One example of a successful model for achieving mother-father concordance is the Growing Up FAST program, as evaluated by Gavazzi. While the program and its evaluation are still in the formative stages—and while different versions of the program have been implemented—one common factor has achieved success across the board: getting a family to establish a shared definition of what success means in a program and in terms of family goals. The Growing Up FAST program explicitly works to achieve concordance between parents on this issue; it did not achieve this outcome as an unin-

tentional byproduct of its work. Concordance is an important program goal, particularly because, as Gavazzi mentioned, families in crisis often do not agree on a number of issues, approaches, and overriding concerns.

Shortshrifting Mothers?

Several participants reminded the Roundtable of a question that underlies all discussions of fathers and their role in the family. If research, policy, and practice all pursue a focus on fathers and the context of fathering, is this done at the expense of attention to mothers? Is there a way to focus on fathers and mothers separately, yet still in tandem?

One participant suggested using examinations of gender roles—both separately and dynamically—to inform intervention design. Are programs set up differently depending on the gender of the parent? How does a parent's gender determine his or her parenting role, style, and authority? While participants agreed that, in the aggregate, there are differences in the types of behaviors exhibited by mothers and fathers and in societal, familial, or cultural expectations of their parenting styles, this is not necessarily an essential factor.

Getting Fathers Involved

According to some participants, research shows that, when adults are referred to an intervention, they usually ask permission to bring their children—and in most cases, it is usually the mother who is referred. However, in 80 percent of two-parent households, when it is the child who is referred to a program or service, the father appears.

Rodriguez recounted his experience with father participation, particularly regarding court-based interventions, in which fathers drop out between their court appearance and the referral location. When his organization greeted participants at their homes, the rate of participants' completion of the program grew by 20 percentage points, from 75 percent to 95 percent. He believes that an essential component for bringing fathers into programs is proactive outreach by practitioners themselves. For example, if a father is due to appear in court, a program might send someone to appear with him. The father would be offered a referral to the organization, thus engaging him from the beginning. "They're more likely to show up to your program if the practitioner is the one who pursues the relationship," Rodriguez explained. "You have to go where they are."

Rodriguez also criticized the tendency of many programs and agencies to operate with a deficit model: "They assume that if a participant continually does not show up, it's the participant who has the problem, not that the program is failing to serve [his] needs." He recommends that programs actively obtain information not only from participating fathers but from those who have dropped out, and apply that information to their own strategies to help change a program.

One common factor has achieved success across the board: getting a family to establish a shared definition of what success means, in a program and in terms of family goals.

Other participants suggested using different strategies and levers to encourage father participation. One option might be to ask the mother to help get a father to participate, rather than simply inviting him directly. Another is to establish leverage with the court system: Court appearance would be required unless a father enrolls and participates in a program. Such "diversion" is particularly effective for fathers in parole programs, since they are mandated and have some leverage in fathers' incentives to avoid court intervention.

Kathy Reich recommends a simple, but perhaps profound, shift in perspective. "Our assumption is that nonresidential fathers would be difficult to get to participate. What would happen if we flipped that assumption on its head? In social services, we assume he won't par-

ticipate; turn it on its head and assume he will, and [he] might rise to meet your expectations."

Helping Families Verbalize Their Processes

Are fathers excluded from a family's identity after parents separate? Do fathers—and mothers—create new bonds with their children? Are these relationships and roles reinforced by programs and agencies? How are new relationships effectively negotiated? While researchers and policymakers need to clarify what they mean when using the term "functional," practitioners can help to inform that consideration, as well as how this "functioning" is measured. By helping families identify, interpret, and articulate their processes, practitioners can not only inform broader work but also help families themselves work toward concurrence and better strategies for achieving shared goals.

Day believes that processes are influenced by factors that occur on three levels: the ordinary/mundane, in which a theoretical position will focus on the everyday rather than the extraordinary; hidden patterns/rules that the family doesn't consciously know exist but are just as well scripted as those they acknowledge; and deeply held beliefs and goals that are not questioned. Practitioners can play a role in helping families to make explicit factors on all three levels, particularly since family members rarely verbalize their processes until questioned or challenged. This role is particularly critical for researchers, since they are measuring perceptions, and often do not know what it is they are measuring or how to interpret the results.

"Fathers are more likely to show up to your program if the practitioner is the one who pursues the relationship. You have to go where they are."

Marsiglio suggested that practitioners can help to identify why shifts occur when people narrate or articulate their experiences. Various family members tell different stories about what happened depending on when they are interviewed, and the same individual may later tell another story after the issue has been resolved. Practitioners can help researchers understand the events that change respondents' thinking, as well as when/why the change in perception/presentation occurred.

Helping Researchers Link Qualitative and Quantitative Studies

Practitioners can be invaluable in helping researchers conduct studies using both quantitative and qualitative analyses: They can assist in refining the questions that need to be asked of respondents at the recruitment level; provide access to families, rather than simply participating in the evaluation of a program or its development; perform protocol analysis; and assist with refining questions in ways that are relevant for a particular population. Researchers, in turn, can train intake officers to perform more in-depth interviews. Ultimately, partnerships with researchers benefit the quality of the services that programs and agencies can provide.

By helping families identify, interpret, and articulate their processes, practitioners can not only inform broader work but also help families themselves work toward concurrence and better strategies for achieving shared goals.

Roundtable Agenda

Roundtable on Fathering and Family Processes

Oakland, California

October 19-20, 2000

Thursday, October 19, 2000

1:00 – 1:30 p.m.	**Introduction and Overview** Vivian Gadsden, Director of NCOFF and Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania Randal D. Day, Brigham Young University; Co-Chair of NCOFF's Fathering and Family Processes Research Team
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.	**Paper I: "Father Involvement, Family Processes, Community Influences, and Teen Problem Behavior: A Plan of Study"** **Author:** Randal Day, Brigham Young University **Commenters:** Ruth Chao, University of California, Riverside Scott Coltrane, University of California, Riverside
2:30 – 3:00 p.m.	**Paper I: General Discussion** **Discussion Leader:** Geraldo Rodriguez
3:00 – 3:15 p.m.	**Break**

3:15 – 4:15 p.m.

Paper II: "The Fathers of Delinquent Youth and Their Participation in Intervention Efforts"

Author: Stephen Gavazzi, The Ohio State University

Commenters: Howard Pinderhughes, University of California, San Francisco
Phillip Bowman, University of Illinois, Chicago

4:15 – 4:45 p.m.

Paper II: General Discussion

Discussion Leader: Eloise Anderson, Claremont Institute, Sacramento

4:45 – 5:00 p.m.

Review and Synthesis: Reflections on the Day

Presenter: Vivian Gadsden, NCOFF

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Dinner Meeting

Speakers: Larry Nelson, Brigham Young University
David Nelson, Brigham Young University

Friday October 20, 2000

8:30 – 8:45 a.m.

Review and Outline of the Day

Presenter: Stephen Gavazzi, Co-Chair of the Research Team

8:45 – 9:45 a.m.

Paper III: "A Conceptual Framework for Family Processes and Their Link to Fathering"

Author: Suzanne Bartle-Haring, The Ohio State Universty

Commenters: Janet Melby, Iowa State University
Maureen Waller, Public Policy Institute of California

9:45 – 10:15 a.m.	**Paper III: General Discussion** **Discussion Leader:** Ray Capper, Marin County Child Development Program
10:15 – 10:30 a.m.	**Break**
10:30 – 11:30 a.m.	**Paper IV: "Youth Ratings of Role Performance of Resident and Nonresident Fathers: A First Look at NLSY97"** **Author:** Alan Acock, Oregon State University **Commenters:** Lynda Clarke, Centre for Population Studies, London, England Deborah Johnson, Michigan State University
11:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**Paper IV: General Discussion** **Discussion Leader:** Henry Hitts, Board of Directors, BAMIN
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.	**Working Groups and Lunch**
2:00 – 3:00 p.m.	**Implications of Issues for Research, Practice, and Policy** **Commenter:** Eloise Anderson **Discussion Leader:** William Marsiglio, University of Florida
3:00 – 3:30 p.m.	**Next Steps and Concluding Remarks** **Presenters:** Randal D. Day, Co-Chair of the Research Team Vivian Gadsden, Director of NCOFF

Participant List

Fathers and Families Second-Tier Roundtable Series
Fathering and Family Processes Roundtable

October 19 and 20, 2000

Name	Position
Alan Acock Oregon State University	researcher
Eloise Anderson Program for the American Family	practitioner
Troy Armstrong California State University, Sacramento	researcher
Suzanne Bartle-Haring The Ohio State University	researcher
Phillip Bowman University of Illinois, Chicago	researcher
Ray Capper Marin County Community Child Development Project	practitioner
Ruth Chao University of California, Riverside	researcher
Lynda Clarke Centre for Population Studies, LSHTM	researcher
Scott Coltrane University of California, Riverside	researcher
James Earl Davis Temple University	researcher
Randal Day Brigham Young University	researcher
Vivian Gadsden University of Pennsylvania	researcher
Stephen Gavazzi The Ohio State University	researcher
Henry Hitts Bay Area Male Involvement Network	practitioner
Jeong-Ran Kim University of Pennsylvania	researcher
Greer Litton Fox University of Tennessee, National Council on Family Relations	researcher

Name	Position
Bill Marsiglio University of Florida	researcher
Janet Melby Institute for Social and Behavioral Research	researcher
Charles Partridge The Ohio State University	researcher
Howard Pinderhughes University of California, San Francisco	researcher
Edward Pitt Families and Work Institute	practitioner
Tom Rane Washington State University	researcher
Aisha Ray The Erikson Institute	researcher
Kathy Reich Social Policy Action Network	policy analyst
Geraldo Rodriguez Los Angeles County Community and Senior Services	practitioner
Angie Schock The Ohio State University	researcher
Suzanne Smith Washington State University	researcher
Maureen Waller Public Policy Institute of California	policy analyst
Thomas Williams California State University, Sacramento	researcher

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)

P5030357